

The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, January 22, 2002, in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

**Present:**

Littman  
Pennington  
Storrs  
Starr  
Reece  
Wright  
Chamberlain  
Waller

**Absent**

Kramer

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Doug Smith, Real Estate and Development Director  
Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative

RESOLUTION

Moved by: Wright

Seconded by: Littman

RESOLVED, that Mr. Dennis Kramer be excused from attendance at this meeting.

MOTION CARRIED

Yeas: All Present (8)

Absent: Kramer

2. MINUTES

Moved by: Reese

Seconded by: Storrs

RESOLVED to approve the November 27, 2001 Planning Commission Special/ Study Meeting Minutes as amended.

Yea:

Abstain

Absent

All Present (8)

Kramer

MOTION CARRIED

**STUDY ITEMS**

3. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REPORT

Mr. Miller asked Ms. Cynthia Pennington if she had been sworn in officially to the BZA.

Ms. Pennington replied no.

Mr. Miller stated that she must be officially sworn in by the City Clerk.

Mr. Storrs stated that Mario's was seeking a setback variance for outdoor seating and it was granted.

Mr. Miller noted City Council granted a variance for parking.

Mr. Reece asked how many parking spaces.

4. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. Miller presented a Sterling Heights commercial rezoning request located at Dequindre and 17 Mile Road. It was determined that the request is compatible with the City of Troy's zoning districts and existing land uses.

Mr. Miller commented about a meeting with Drury Inn and that they are considering expanding and removing their pool. Also, there is a possibility that Macaroni Grill will replace O'Grady's.

Mr. Miller stated that Rexpointe Kennels will be coming back to the Planning Commission in the near future and that they will be reducing the building size somewhat.

Biltmore Properties is looking at two projects and they are considering the use of PUDs.

Doug Smith, Real Estate and Development Director, commented on the Civic Center/Conference Center Study. He stated it should be back to City Council around February 13<sup>th</sup>.

5. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REPORT

Mr. Smith noted the appointment of a new member, Michelle Hodges, who is the Executive Director of the Troy Chamber of Commerce.

6. SITE PLAN REVIEW – Proposed Rhode Island Estates Site Condominium, North of Big Beaver, East and West sides of Rhode Island, Section 24, R-1E

Mr. Miller stated that this was previously tabled at the November 13<sup>th</sup> meeting in order for the petitioner to revise the proposed site condominium. The Planning Department developed a couple of different development options; however, have since recognized the property didn't have sufficient depth on the east side of Rhode Island. Apparently the petitioner has acquired 200 additional feet east of Rhode Island. The actual plan for the property has not been submitted at this time. However, the overall traffic circulation was prepared by staff. In addition, it is recognized that Orpington needs sidewalks for safe pedestrian travel.

Mr. De Florio made a presentation including a new design. He stated that the stormwater detention pond is located in the original location and it gave him the opportunity to discuss the project with some of the neighbors. One of the gentlemen who spoke at the last meeting is here in support of the revised proposal, including the 200 foot extension to the east. Mr. De Florio stated the new plan is a better utilization of the land and is similar to the City's alternative #4.

Mr. Storrs asked Mr. De Florio if he envisioned closing Rhode Island.

Mr. De Florio stated he envisions Rhode Island coming to a T intersection with Cedar Knoll. This issue is really up to Planning's recommendation.

Mr. De Florio further stated that there are three deep lots west of Rhode Island and one is shallow to allow for the stormwater detention area. A walkway is

proposed to access the open space left as a natural preserve. That his intention is to turn over ownership of the open space to the City.

Mr. Chamberlain addressed Ms. Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney, asking if Mr. De Florio gave the open space property to the City, could we look at deed restrictions. Would that be appropriate?

Ms. Lancaster stated that it would be appropriate.

Mr. Smith stated that the City looks at two items before accepting donated property. First, does it improve stormwater retention or filtration and secondly, does it have natural features.

Mr. Chamberlain stated he liked the idea of the City receiving the property.

Ms. Pennington asked, that with all the trees it would it be a natural features park.

Mr. Miller stated that there are not that many trees on the park area.

Ms. Pennington stated I think it's a great idea.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he feels the City needs more pocket parks and his recommendation is that the City takes ownership of the property with deed restrictions.

Ms. Pennington stated that she liked this idea and she would like to see it happen more often.

Mr. Waller stated the Planning Commission has three weeks before the next meeting and it would give them some time to do their homework.

Ms. Lancaster stated that if the City didn't accept the property, it might be possible that the property could be made into a common area with the condition it would be opened up to the public.

Mr. Reece stated that he endorses a park, but ownership is not a priority.

Mr. Keoleian agreed with the open space.

Ms. Pennington agreed with the open space.

Mr. Waller stated he agreed with the open space and that it would set a precedence.

Mr. Starr agreed with the open space.

Mr. Littman disagreed with a city park, but agreed with the open space.

Mr. Storrs agreed with the open space.

Mr. Wright agreed with the open space

Mr. Chamberlain commented on the street pattern and that by not opening up all the way to Big Beaver and possibly adding a cul-de-sac would be a great idea.

7. LAND USE AND ZONING STUDY – Crooks Road at Big Beaver Road

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he had visited the area and that in checking out the area north of Denny's there is a detention pond that is a poster child on why we need to improve this detention pond. He asked that all members of the Planning Commission visit the site, because the aerial photos do not really relay the problems.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that while he was on the north side of the study area, he noticed a big open curb cut north of Big Beaver. The traffic patterns are unorganized and there is an artificial curb that causes a 6 inch drop. There are elevation differences between Denny's and the parcel to the south. The rear areas of these businesses are really bad. In order to do this right, we need to establish who owns everyone of these parcels in the study area. We need to identify the problems and put the parking in the rear of the buildings and get more landscaped green areas.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that on the south side of Big Beaver, the office building, Szechuan Gardens and Kirby's ownership patterns need to be shown. The driveway should be consolidated and the parking requirements and cross-access easements need to be addressed. The backsides of these buildings need to be cleaned up.

Mr. Waller asked what has the City done in the past. Sunoco is depressed with a lower elevation. What we should do is make this a community effort and involve several of the business people and property owners. We need cooperation with the owners, the City, and the DDA to make it better for all the residents of the City.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the DDA will work with the Planning Commission and the City.

Mr. Waller stated the objective is to make the study area safer for citizens and improve traffic flow.

Mr. Littman stated we need to reduce the drives at the gas station on the north.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we have to do a sales job on this project.

Mr. Wright stated that on the north side of Big Beaver the wide drive is a horrible problem.

Bob Schultz, 883 Kirts, asked who put the parking bumpers at Einstein Bagels to separate the businesses. There are a lot of traffic conflicts in that area. The gas station on the north will need two drives off of Big Beaver as there is very little maneuvering room. The south side of Big Beaver at the 7-eleven, lunch hour is the most congested.

Mr. Storrs stated we should do some brainstorming regarding the north side of Big Beaver.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that is a long term problem. We need to get these stores closer to Crooks and put the parking in the rear.

Mr. Reece commented on a master curb cut plan for the whole thing.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we want to look at rezoning to make all areas compatible.

Mr. Miller stated that the Planning Department is looking for direction to prepare the Land Use and Zoning Study.

Mr. Storrs asked what is a good zoning for the district.

Mr. Waller asked if we can have special development rules. He also stated that the general agreement seems to be that we need to rethink our building setbacks. We need to think of something unique within the DDA district.

Mr. Miller stated you can create overlay zoning districts because it is a special area, you can have different requirements for the DDA area. Also, there are other options that will be provided in the future.

Mr. Waller stated there are many options and we have to look at each situation.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we need to study the detention pond south to Big Beaver and further south to Butterfield.

Mr. Reese stated that we need to set down some criteria including drives, buildings, and inter-connectivity within the Big Beaver corridor study. We need to do some master planning.

Mr. Chamberlain stated there are short term immediate solutions and also long term planning issues.

Mr. Storrs stated on the north side, the short term solutions should address driveways and cross-access.

Mr. Chamberlain stated access to Big Beaver is a concern and to equalize the difference in elevations between properties. We need to create a package of recommendations to City Council and a copy to the DDA.

Mr. Reece asked about short term funding and going to the DDA.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we will bring it up with the DDA. We need to create a guide for redevelopment.

Mr. Reece commented on 28<sup>th</sup> Street in Grand Rapids and maybe we should take a look at that.

Mr. Schultz suggested we look more at landscape standards around parking areas and parking structures. Cars could be hidden from the road with the right landscaping.

Mr. Storrs stated that berms don't work and landscaping is a good ideal.

Mr. Waller asked if this moves forward, how are we going to get the business owners to buy into this. We can suggest improvements but we can't order them.

Mr. Miller stated we should demand, through zoning ordinance requirements, more vegetation around our parking areas.

Mr. Chamberlain agreed.

#### 8. LAND USE AND ZONING STUDY – Long Lake Road and Dequindre Road

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the northwest quadrant of the study area is the same drill as the northwest quadrant on Crooks and Big Beaver. The south side is a bit easier. We need to get cross-access and joint drives.

Mr. Miller asked about Dequindre Road.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that south of Long Lake is not a problem right now.

Mr. Storrs asked what kind of leverage do we have for people to go along with these improvements.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we need to look at the various zoning requirements in these areas. The south side will be more difficult.

Mr. Starr stated we need to add more landscaped areas north of Long Lake Road.

Mr. Chamberlain stated there was ten times too much parking.

Mr. Chamberlain asked legal about the Cranberry House and that they were ordered to post their maximum occupancy limits in their lobby and they have not done it.

Ms. Lancaster stated she would check that out.

Mr. Waller stated this area will be easier than the Crooks/Big Beaver area. Maybe this area should be a test case because it is easier. I am encouraged by this study, however, if you want results, the recommendations will have to be presented correctly.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we need to investigate setback requirements for gas stations and the pumps.

9. SPECIAL USE APPROVAL STUDY – C-F, B-1, B-2, B-3, and H-S

The Planning Commission and Staff initiated discussions of the appropriate Special Uses for the C-F, B-1, B-2, B-3 and H-S Zoning Districts.

Mr. Chamberlain stated let's start with no special uses and justify what should be a special use.

Ms. Pennington asked about B-3 and Automotive Repair Garages.

Mr. Miller stated that they do tune-ups, mufflers, etc. They cannot tear down cars and cannot do any type of body work.

Mr. Waller commented on B-3, 22.30.04, Veterinary hospitals and clinics, asking if they have to be special uses. What is the rationale.

Mr. Miller stated he could not answer.

Mr. Reece commented that years ago the wording for special use was stated as "you may permit it" or "you shall permit it", it left some discretion to the Planning Commission.



Mr. Miller stated that the Planning Commission has the authority to deny a special use. Requests have to meet the standards that are set forth. The Planning Commission can deny a request if they do not meet the standards.

Mr. Chamberlain stated why not just throw them out and get justification as to why we need them and rewrite the ordinance.

Mr. Littman stated Veterinary hospitals and clinics do walk the animals. It is better to keep the special use in order to review potential problems.

Mr. Chamberlain asked why is there so much control? There is no enforcement.

Mr. Starr stated he cannot remember denying a special use request.

Mr. Littman stated there are not many special use denials, but we work towards changing or improving the site with special use conditions.

Mr. Storrs commented on B-2, Drive up windows and stated we need these as a special use. The issues can be dealt with a site plan review. He also commented on 21.30.04 Open Air Business. Why do we need special use for those land uses.

Mr. Chamberlain stated let's review the uses and get them out of special use approval.

Mr. Storrs also commented on B-3, Outdoor Sales stating it is not necessary. In the H-S District, the first three could be removed or at least we should combine the three. We need to look at the ordinance language.

Mr. Miller stated hotels/motels do not fit in the H-S District. Why is B-3 a special use.

Mr. Waller commented on B-3, stating we need to have 22.30.02. In the H-S District, the following should be deleted: 23.30.07, 23.30.08, and 23.30.10. We need to research the ordinance language.

Mr. Chamberlain stated hotels and motels should be removed. Why did we have to have them in special use anyways.

Mr. Miller stated that it was hard for him to answer as he was not here at the time. Hotels and motels were probably in H-S because the district was initially used near exits of the freeways.

Mr. Chamberlain asked Mr. Miller to research 23.30.05, drive-up service facilities.

Mr. Starr stated that H-S is probably a misnomer the way we're using it.

Mr. Chamberlain asked which use should be removed from B-2.

Mr. Miller stated that regarding indoor recreation and open air business, you have to be careful.

Mr. Chamberlain asked about C-F 18.30.06, do we really have any say over public institutions.

Ms. Lancaster stated it depends on the state statutes. She will have to check because most of them have an exemption from state law.

Mr. Chamberlain asked why does a public institution need a special use approval.

Ms. Lancaster stated that the outdated list provided more ability to control under special use. The control is an important factor.

Mr. Chamberlain asked why do we need such control over business areas.

Ms. Lancaster stated zoning by right, principal permitted use, you must have up front standards. Special use approval allows for conditions applied to the development.

Mr. Chamberlain requested that Mr. Miller encapsulate all of the comments after the next discussion, then put them all together for review.

#### 10. ORDINANCE REVISION DISCUSSION

##### Fence & Walls adjacent to Natural Buffers – Discussion of Zoning Ordinance revision direction.

Mr. Kramer stated we should require posts or pilings and use of panels to allow water to flow under so as not to disturb vegetation.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the Development Standards regulate 1-6 detention basins.

Mr. Miller agreed that the Development Standards regulate stormwater detention.

Stormwater Detention Basin Slope & Fencing – Discussion of Development Standards.

Mr. Storrs stated that underground stormwater detention should not be permitted.

Mr. Chamberlain asked Mr. Storrs to write down his revisions and give them to Mr. Miller.

Mr. Littman asked are there other standards that ban detention basins.

Mr. Reece stated front yards are okay.

Mr. Chamberlain stated these could become variance issues.

Office Height Requirement & Architectural Projections – Discussion of Zoning Ordinance requirements, within the O-M Office Mid-Rise District.

Mr. Storrs and Mr. Miller will coordinate to write the ordinance revisions.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Dave Lakin, 4610 Luisa, lives next to St. Anastasia Catholic Church and asked what's happening with the wall requirements.

Mr. Chamberlain explained that walls and berms destroy existing vegetation.

Mr. Miller stated he has worked previously with Dave Lakin. He noted that Mr. Lakin is a competent Municipal Civil Engineer.

Mr. Lakin commented on spread or trench footings and stormwater detention. He stated that sometimes retention has to be in front yards due to natural drainage patterns. Currently, underground detention is popular and many developers use this method.

Mr. Lakin further stated that there are maintenance concerns for underground stormwater structures. He also stated that surface detention basins have aesthetic problems.

For the Good of the Order

Mr. Reece mentioned site condo development access and too many driveways.

Mr. Chamberlain stated it was on the list he is preparing for Planning Commission projects.

Mr. Littman stated he missed the last meeting and asked if the extra study meeting is scheduled every month on the first Tuesday.

Mr. Chamberlain answered yes, but, maybe not in the summer.

Mr. Storrs commented on St. Anastasia's and disagrees how the parking lots setbacks were interpreted. We still need to think about this.

Mr. Chamberlain stated the City has to follow its own ordinances. The Police and Fire Training Center has no right for outside storage. If it is a temporary situation that might be all right. The trash container is not within an enclosure. North of Square Lake, the Fire Station has a junk automobile outside and the station is surrounded by residential. At Rochester and Big Beaver, the Fire Station has their dumpster adjacent to residential front yards with no screening.

Mr. Storrs stated that the Police and Fire Training Center does not have stormwater detention.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the Police and Fire Training Center does not meet the signage setback.

Mr. Lakin stated the Training Center may not be required to have detention because it abuts a County drain.

12. Meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director